

REMARKS

Reconsideration is requested.

In paragraph 1 of the Office Action, the Examiner refers to part of the specification and objects that from this it is unclear on which side of the wing the key operable lock means are dispensed. Unfortunately, the Examiner has inadvertently failed to indicate the page of the specification to which he is referring, making it difficult to respond. Applicant's attorney assumes the Examiner is referring to page 1, third and fifth paragraphs. This rejection is respectfully traversed. By naming these two lock means differently, it should be clear which is which and where each is disposed. Thus in the third paragraph on page 1, there is reference to lock means arranged for key operation at the other side of the wing, i.e., at the opposite side of the wing to that at which the operating member is operable. In the fifth paragraph on page 1, the wording used is different, i.e., key operable lock means at said one side of the wing. It is respectfully submitted that it is fairly clear that there is a difference between lock means for key operation at the **other** side of the wing, and key operable lock means at said **one** side of the wing.

With regard to the objections raised in paragraph 2 of the Office Action, Applicant has amended the claims to rename the lock means arranged for key operation at the other side of the wing as "first lock means", and to rename the key operable lock means at said one side of the wing being defined as "second lock means". In so redefining the two lock means, Applicant felt it appropriate now to refer merely to "operation" rather than "key operation", and has amended the claims accordingly. These amendments are for clarification only and no narrowing of the claims is intended.

Claim 32 now defines the first lock means for operation at the other side of the wing, while Claim 36 introduces the second lock means at said one side of the wing. Claim 37

also refers to the second lock means, as do Claims 41 and 43, while Claim 45 again refers to the first lock means. Claim 46 has been amended to refer to "key insertion" rather than "the key insertion", while Claim 63 has been amended to incorporate all the amendments made to the preceding claims, where appropriate.

With regard to the rejections of paragraph 3 of the Office Action, it is respectfully submitted that the Examiner is misinterpreting the claims. The Office Action refers to the reference in Claim 32 to the key operation of the lock means "de-actuating" the blocking means. It then refers to the lock means being "operated" at the other side of the wing and does not appear to distinguish the difference between "operation" of the block means and "de-actuation" thereof. It is respectfully submitted that it is clear that "operation" means to move the block means to a position where it prevents retraction of the bolt by the operating member, whereas "de-actuation" is the reverse, where the blocking means is removed from the position in which it prevents movement of the operating handle and thus retraction of the bolt. However, for increased clarity, the term "operable" in relation to the bringing of the locking means into operation has been changed to "can be actuatable" so that there is a direct comparison between actuation and de-actuation respectively of the blocking means.

It is respectfully submitted that the deduction at the end of paragraph 3 of the Office Action is incorrect, as a result of a failure to clearly appreciate the difference between actuation and de-actuation of the blocking means. With regard to the objection to Claim 65, it is believed that the wording makes clear that the reference to "its other end" refers to "said member". However, for increased clarity, the claim has been reworded to recite, ". . . wherein said member, at its other end, defines a surface. . .".

Claims 32 and 35-41 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 4,563,885 to Madden. This is believed to be due to a misunderstanding of the difference between the two lock means of the inside and outside of the door. Claim 32 now specifies that the blocking means are operable from said one side of the wing. This is not the case with Madden where the blocking means can only be operated (actuated) from the outside of the wing by the lock means. Moreover in the light of the Examiner's allowance of Claims 33 and 34, new independent Claims 70 and 71 have been drafted so as also to overcome disclosure of Madden. The Examiner's rejections of the other claims in paragraphs 8 to 10 of the Office Action are largely incorrect in the light of misinterpretation of all of the references to the lock means being taken as lock means of the outside of the door only. It is respectfully submitted that the clarifying amendments to the claims make clear the distinctions between Applicant's claimed invention and the prior art.

In view of the foregoing, allowance of Claims 32-49 and 63-71 is requested.

The Examiner is requested to telephone the undersigned if the Examiner believes such would facilitate prosecution of the present application. The undersigned is available for telephone consultation at any time.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: August 6, 2003

By:


Deepak Malhotra
Reg. No. 33,560